REDACTED VERSION PURSUANT TO 35-A M.R.S.A. § 704(5)

STATE OF MAINE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 2002-715

February 25, 2003

Appeal of Consumer Assistance Division Decision # 13910 Regarding Central Maine Power Company ORDER ON APPEAL

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

I. SUMMARY

In this Order, we uphold the Consumer Assistance Division (CAD) decision concerning a billing dispute between Central Maine Power Company (CMP) and its **[customer]**.

II. BACKGROUND

[Customer] contacted CAD in October 2002 disputing a balance due to CMP on an account at 173 Pine Ridge Park, Lot #21 in Livermore Falls. The CAD's investigation revealed that [Customer] established the account in her name in May 2001. CMP records further revealed that [Customer] finalized the account in August 2001. At that time, there was a balance owed of \$356.89. [Customer] disputes that she owes this amount, as she never resided at that location. She claims her daughter or the landlord at that location should be responsible for the bill.

On November 8, 2002, CAD issued its decision finding that **[Customer]** was responsible for paying for usage that occurred while the account was under her name. On November 15, 2002, Customer appealed that decision to the Commission

III. DISCUSSION AND DECISION

In her appeal letter, **[Customer]** disputes some of the facts surrounding this case. **[Customer]** admits that she requested service at the Livermore Falls address on behalf of her daughter and granddaughter. She disputes that she ever lived at the address or that she finalized the account in August 2001.

The names of the individuals living at the account address are not relevant to who is responsible for paying the bills. As long as the account remains in a customer's name, that customer is responsible to CMP for paying for the usage that occurs there. If **[Customer]** believes other individuals living at that address should pay for the usage, she will need to pursue that with those individuals directly. With regard to access to CMP records, a customer may obtain a copy of the records that CAD reviewed in reaching its decision by contacting the Consumer Assistance Division at (800) 452-4699.

REDACTED VERSION PURSUANT TO 35-A M.R.S.A. § 704(5)

Or	der	On	An	peal
•	4 0.	\mathbf{v}	, , ,	POU:

2

Docket No. 2002-715

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 25th day of February, 2003.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Dennis L. Keschl Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR: Welch

Nugent Diamond

REDACTED VERSION PURSUANT TO 35-A M.R.S.A. § 704(5)

Order On Appeal

3

Docket No. 2002-715

NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

- 1. <u>Reconsideration</u> of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
- 2. <u>Appeal of a final decision</u> of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within **21 days** of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.
- 3. <u>Additional court review</u> of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.